

**REMARKS:**

Claims 4, 8, and 16 have previously been cancelled.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-15, and 17-35 remain in the application for consideration of the Examiner.

The Office Action indicates that formal drawings are required. Accordingly, formal drawings are attached, replacing the original informal drawings.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-15, and 17-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Bowman-Amuah (U.S. Patent No. 6,636,242).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 1 (as well as claims 2, 3, 5-7, 9, 10, and 19-25, which depend from claim 1), Bowman-Amuah fails to disclose or suggest at least the following limitations:

- Generating a work item representing the job to be performed, the work item comprising a change history;
- Placing said work item into a queue based at least in part on the category of the work item;
- Each queue of the plurality of queues in which a work item can be placed is for storing work items representing jobs to be performed;
- Updating the change history of the work item; and
- Placing the work item into one of a plurality of queues based at least in part on one or more tasks to be executed on the work item.

The Office Action alleges that Bowman-Amuah discloses generating a work item representing the job to be performed, the work item comprising a change history. However, this allegation is respectfully traversed. A review of Bowman-Amuah, including

the portions of Bowman-Amuah cited in the Office Action, revealed no disclosure or teaching of this limitation.

The Office Action alleges that Bowman-Amuah discloses placing said work item into a queue based at least in part on the category of the work item. However, this allegation is respectfully traversed. A review of Bowman-Amuah, including the portions of Bowman-Amuah cited in the Office Action, revealed no disclosure or teaching of this limitation. While Bowman-Amuah does disclose the use of queues for such things as print jobs and messages between applications, such disclosure falls short of anticipating the placing of a work item into a queue based at least in part on the category of the work item. Further, the Office Action appears to be equating the table discussed at col. 110, line 57- col. 111, line 45 to the presently claimed work item (applicants, however, do not concede that the table equates to the claimed work item), and there is no disclosure in Bowman-Amuah that the tables are queued, or that the tables are queued into a queue based at least in part on the category of the table.

The Office Action alleges that Bowman-Amuah discloses that each queue of the plurality of queues in which a work item can be placed is for storing work items representing jobs to be performed. However, this allegation is respectfully traversed. As discussed above, Bowman-Amuah does not disclose the queuing of work items, so it necessarily follows that Bowman-Amuah also fails to disclose or suggest a plurality of queues for storing work items representing jobs to be performed.

The Office Action alleges that Bowman-Amuah discloses updating the change history of a work item. However, this allegation is respectfully traversed. As discussed above, Bowman-Amuah does not disclose generating a work item representing a job to be performed, where the work item comprises a change history. Thus, it necessarily follows that Bowman-Amuah also fails to disclose or suggest updating the change history of a work item.

The Office Action alleges that Bowman-Amuah discloses placing the work item into one of a plurality of queues based at least in part on one or more tasks to be executed on the work item. However, this allegation is respectfully traversed. As discussed above,

Bowman-Amuah does not disclose the queuing of work items, so it necessarily follows that Bowman-Amuah also fails to disclose or suggest placing the work item into one of a plurality of queues based at least in part on one or more tasks to be executed on the work item.

With respect to claim 11, this claim recites limitations similar to at least some of those discussed above in connection with claim 1. Therefore, the discussion above in connection with claim 1 applies equally to claim 11, as well as claims 12-15, 17, 18, and 26-35, which depend from claim 11.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-15, and 17-35 cannot be anticipated by Bowman-Amuah. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-15, and 17-35 are in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

**THE LEGAL STANDARD FOR ANTICIPATION REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102:**

The following sets forth the legal standards for "anticipation."

The events that can lead to anticipation can be divided into the following seven categories, all defined by statute:

1. Prior Knowledge: The invention was publicly known in the United States before the patentee invented it.
2. Prior Use: The invention was publicly used in the United States either (i) before the patentee invented it; or (ii) more than one year before he filed his patent application.
3. Prior Publication: The invention was described in a printed publication anywhere in the world either (i) before the patentee invented it; or (ii) more than one year before he filed his patent application.

4. Prior Patent: The invention was patented in another patent anywhere in the world either (i) before the patentee invented it; or (ii) more than one year before he filed his application.

5. On Sale: The invention was on sale in the United States more than one year before the patentee filed his application.

6. Prior Invention: The invention was invented by another person in the United States before the patentee invented it, and that other person did not abandon, suppress or conceal the invention.

7. Prior U.S. Patent: The invention was described in a patent granted on a patent application filed in the United States before the patentee made the invention.

Each of those seven events has its own particular requirements, but they all have the following requirements in common:

1. Anticipation must be shown by clear and convincing evidence.
2. If one prior art reference completely embodies the same process or product as any claim, the product or process of that claim is anticipated by the prior art, and that claim is invalid. To decide whether anticipation exists, one must consider each of the elements recited in the claim and determine whether all of them are found in the particular item alleged to be anticipating prior art.
3. There is no anticipation unless every one of those elements is found in a *single* prior publication, prior public use, prior invention, prior patent, prior knowledge or prior sale. One may not combine two or more items of prior art to make out an anticipation. One should, however, take into consideration, not only what is expressly disclosed or embodied in the particular item of prior art, but also what inherently occurred in its practice.
4. There cannot be an accidental or unrecognized anticipation. A prior duplication of the claimed invention that was accidental, or unrecognized, unappreciated, and incidental to some other purpose is not an invalidating anticipation.

Those four requirements must be kept in mind and applied to each kind of anticipation in issue. The following additional requirements apply to some categories of anticipation.

1. Prior Knowledge: An invention is anticipated if it was known by others in the United States before it was invented by the patentee. "Known," in this context, means known to the public. Private knowledge, secret knowledge or knowledge confined to a small, limited group is not necessarily an invalidating anticipation. Things that were known to the public only outside the United States are not invalidating anticipation.

2. Prior Use: An invention is anticipated if it was used by others before it was invented by the patentee, or more than one year before the patentee filed his patent application. "Use," in this context, means a public use.

3. Prior Publication: A patent is invalid if the invention defined by the claims was described in a printed publication before it was invented by the patentee or more than one year prior to the filing date of his application. For a publication to constitute an anticipation of an invention, it must be capable, when taken in conjunction with the knowledge of people of ordinary skill in the art, of placing the invention in the possession of the reader. The disclosure must be enabling and meaningful. In determining whether the disclosure is complete, enabling, and meaningful, one should take into account what would have been within the knowledge of a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time, and one may consider other publications that shed light on the knowledge such a person would have had.

4. Prior Patent: If the invention defined by the claims was patented in the United States or a foreign country, either before it was invented by the inventor or more than one year before the inventor filed his patent application, then the invention was anticipated. The effective date for this type of anticipation is the date on which two things co-existed: (i) the owner of the referenced patent had the right to enforce that patent; and (ii) the reference patent was available to the public. What was "patented" in the reference patent is determined by what is defined by its claims, interpreted in the light of the general description.

5. On Sale: A patent is invalid if the invention claimed in it was on sale in the United States more than one year prior to the application filing date.

6. Prior Invention: If the invention defined by the claims was invented by another person, in the United States, before it was invented by the inventor, and that other person did not abandon, suppress, or conceal the invention, the invention lacks novelty. A prior invention, even if put in physical form and shown to produce the desired result, is not an invalidating anticipation unless some steps were taken to make it public. However, it is not necessary that the inventor had knowledge of that prior invention.

7. Prior U.S. Application: A patent is invalid for lack of novelty if the invention defined by the claims was described in a United States patent issued on a patent application filed by another person before the invention was made by the inventor. The effective date of a prior application for purposes of this issue is the date on which it was filed in the United States. Foreign-filed patent applications do not apply. If the issued United States patent claims the benefit of more than one United States application, its effective date as an anticipation is the filing date of the first United States application that discloses the invention claimed in that referenced patent.

Experimental Use Exception: The law recognizes that it is beneficial to permit the inventor the time and opportunity to develop his invention. As such there is an "experimental use" exception to the "public use" and "on sale" rules. Even though the invention was publicly used or on sale, more than one year prior to the application filing date, that does not invalidate the patent, provided the principal purpose was experimentation rather than commercial benefit. If the primary purpose was experimental, it does not matter that the public used the invention or that the inventor incidentally derived profit from it.

When a public use or sale is shown, the burden is on the inventor to come forward with evidence to support the experimental use exception. Only experimentation by or under the control of the inventor qualifies for this exception. Experimentation by a third party, for its own purposes, does not qualify for this exception. Once the invention leaves the inventor's control, its use is a public one, even if further experimentation takes place.

The experimentation must relate to the claimed features of the invention. And it must be for the purpose of technological improvement, not commercial exploitation. If any commercial exploitation does occur, it must be merely incidental to the primary purpose of experimentation. A test done primarily for marketing, and only incidentally for technological improvement, is a public use.

**CONCLUSION:**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and early reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

The undersigned hereby authorizes the Director to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayments, to **Deposit Account No. 500777**. If an extension of time is necessary for allowing the Amendment to be timely filed, this document is to be construed as also constituting a Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) to the extent necessary. Any fee required for such Petition for Extension of Time should be charged to **Deposit Account No. 500777**.

**Please link this application to Customer No. 53184 so that its status may be checked via the PAIR System.**

Respectfully submitted,

30 JUNE 2005

Date



James E. Walton, Registration No. 47,245  
Daren C. Davis, Registration No. 38,425  
Brian E. Harris, Registration No. 48,383  
Michael Alford, Registration No. 48,707  
Law Offices of James E. Walton, P.L.L.C.  
1169 N. Burleson Blvd., Suite 107-328  
Burleson, Texas 76028  
(817) 447-9955 (voice)  
(817) 447-9954 (facsimile)  
jim@waltonpllc.com (e-mail)

**CUSTOMER NO. 53184**  
**ATTORNEYS AND AGENTS FOR APPLICANT**



**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

The attached sheet of drawings includes formalized versions of all of the original Figures 1-5. This sheet, which includes Figures 1-5, replaces all of the original informal drawings.